REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 and 5-12 are now in pending in this application. Claims 1 and 5-7 are rejected. Claims 3, 4, 8 and 9 are objected to. Claim 4 is cancelled herein. Claim 2 is previously cancelled. The specification is amended to address minor inconsistencies in wording regarding the rotor and shaft.

Claims 1, 3 and 5-7 are amended herein to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues. For example, the subject matter of claim 4 is now incorporated into claim 1, wording is clarified with respect to "both ends" now being recited as "opposing sides," the "groove sections" now being referred to as "U-shaped groove sections" since the grooves were previously recited as having a U-shape. None of these amendments is narrowing nor necessary to further distinguish the claims from the applied art, the amendments are made merely to place the claims into a more readable form also complying with patent practice requirements. The elements of the claims are not considered limited to specific corresponding structures in the drawings. Other formal matters are attended to that were not addressed by the Examiner and accordingly are considered unrelated to substantive patentability issues. New claims 10-12 are added. For the convenience of the Examiner, APPENDIX I is provided herewith having a complete set of pending claims with all amendments effected therein.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention as a result of informalities stated in the Office Action. Claim 5 is amended as suggested noted in the Office Action.

With regard to the rejection of claim 7, applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's basis for the rejection. The claim is not addressed merely to a method as suggested in the Office Action, but rather sets forth a positive structural limitation that the coils are formed from self-welding wire. As explained in the specification, self-welding wire allows the wire of the formed coil to self adhere to itself by application of heat or a solvent. While the use of self-welding wire does entail process steps, the formation of the coil from the self-welding wire positively requires use of such wire in the coil. Since self-welding wire is different from insulated wire used to make coils which is not self-welding in the chemical content of the insulation on the wire, the resultant coil is necessarily different from a coil formed of wire which is not self-welding and must subsequently be coated to adhere the wire together. The wire has a different insulation on the wire itself which does not self adhere. Hence, a coil produced using self-winding wire results in a finished product which is different from a coil formed of wire that is not self-welding just as self-welding wire is different from wire that is not self-welding.

In view of the above, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 5-7 and their allowance are earnestly requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 1 is rejected as obvious over the Fumito ('287) reference in view of the Bernauer reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 5 and 6 are rejected as obvious over the Fumito reference in view of the Holmes reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

The Office Action indicates that claim 4 contains allowable subject matter. The subject matter of claim 4 is now incorporated into claim 1. Hence claim 1, reflects of the subject matter claim 4 as filed and therefore distinguishes over the applied references.

Claim 5 presently recites that "the second magnetic pole cores are configured to slidably pass through the cylindrical core sections in an axial direction of the cylindrical core sections until the bridging sections contact side faces of the first magnetic pole cores of the connection body part." In the JP '287 reference the rotor is inserted into the bobbins 29 in the axial direction of the rotor which is

perpendicular to an axis of the bobbins 29. This is because they cannot be slid onto the pole cores in the cylindrical axis direction because the pole cores are formed with extension portions 8a which create a structure that does not permit such assembly. Hence, the coil of the JP'287 reference must be wound after the bobbin is put in place because the bobbin must be open at a side to permit installation.

With regard to the Holmes disclosure, the bobbins of the armatures are mounted on toothed poles of a stator which face inward. Hence, the structure of the Holmes does not teach the provision of armature coils on bobbins with bridging portions which rest against side faces of other armature poles provided by crisscrossed connected parts as present ly claimed.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims 1, 5 and 6 are not obvious in view of the applied references for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 5 and 6 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

It is respectfully submitted that new claim 10 further distinguishes over the applied references because the applied references cannot suggest the claimed pole piece sections fixed to the magnetic pole cores after installation of the armature coils. Such a structure permitting this assembly sequence is not disclosed by the JP '287

reference because the extensions of pole pieces are integral with pole cores in the JP'287 reference and hence cannot be attached after the armature coils are disposed. The Holmes reference lacks such extensions of the pole cores and the Bernauer reference has integral extensions similar to the JP '287 extensions. The presently claimed assembly order results in a structure inherently different from that of the JP '287 reference, i.e., one that requires attachment of the pole pieces after coil deposition.

New claim 11 recites the subject matter of claim 3 indicated as allowable in the Office Action and is therefore submitted as allowable.

New independent claim 12 recites the combined subject matter of claim 1 and claim 3 which indicated is as allowable in the Office Action and is therefore submitted as allowable.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Applicant respectfully requests a one month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. **The fee of $120.00 for the extension is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.**

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is

missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By _____
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

by and,

By _____
Herbert F. Ruschmann
Reg. No. 35,341
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340